REMARKS

Brief Summary

Claims 1-34 were pending. Claims 1, 8-12 and 17-34 were rejected. Claims 2-7 and 13-16 were objected to. By virtue of this response, claims 24-28 and 32-34 have been cancelled, claims 1-23 and 29-31 have been amended, and new claims 35-40 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-23, 29-31 and 35-40 are currently under consideration.

Applicant thanks the examiner for the careful examination of this patent application.

Claim Objections

The examiner objected to claims 13-15 as having extraneous language. Claims 13-15 have been amended to remove this extraneous language, which is the result of a clerical error.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC Section 102

The examiner rejected claims 1, 8-12 and 21-34 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Son et al. (USP 6,049,245).

Applicant has amended claim 1 as follows.

> 1. (Amended) A circuit for use with a supply voltage and an effective ground voltage, comprising:
>
> a multi-state circuit that includes a first PMOS device and a first NMOS device, the multi-state circuit being operable to switch between a first state in which the first PMOS device is turned on and the first NMOS device is turned off and a second state in which the first PMOS device is turned off and the first NMOS device is turned on;

> mode control circuit transistors that serve as power and power ground source transistors when the multi-state circuit is in an active mode and that serve as self-reverse biased cut-off transistors when the multi-state circuit is in the standby mode, including,
>
> a second NMOS device, with a drain connected to a supply voltage terminal and with a source connected to a source of the first PMOS device; and
>
> a second PMOS device, with a drain connected to an effective ground terminal and with a source connected to a source of the first NMOS device;
>
> wherein the multi-state circuit and the mode control circuit transistors are disposed in an integrated circuit;
>
> means for providing a turn on voltage signal to a gate of the second NMOS device that is higher than the supply voltage when the multi-state circuit is in an active mode; and
>
> means for providing a turn on voltage signal to a gate of the second PMOS device that is lower than the effective ground voltage when the multi-state circuit is in an active mode.

An example of the support for the portion of the amendment to claim 1 pertaining to the, "mode control circuit transistors", is found in the specification at paragraph [0039] which states,

> "The second PMOS and second NMOS transistors M1 and M3 control the active/standby mode of the multi-state circuit. When the second PMOS and second NMOS transistors M1, M3 are turned on, the multi-state circuit is in an active mode. When the second PMOS and second NMOS transistors M1, M3 are turned off, the multi-state circuit is in a standby mode."

Additional support for the portion of the amendment to claim 1 pertaining to the, "mode control transistors", is found in the specification at paragraph [0042] which states,

> "Thus, M1 and M3 serve as power and power ground source transistors when the multi-state circuit is in active mode, and they

serve as self reverse-biased cut-off transistors when the multi-state circuit is in standby mode."

An example of support for the portion of the amendment to claim 1 pertaining to the "means" elements is found in Figure 11 and in the specification at paragraphs [0061]-[0068] at pages 16-20.

Applicant respectfully submits that Son et al. do not teach or suggest,

"means for providing a turn on voltage signal to a gate of the second NMOS device that is higher than the supply voltage when the multi-state circuit is in an active mode;".

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Son et al. do not teach or suggest,

"means for providing a turn on voltage signal to a gate of the second PMOS device that is lower than the effective ground voltage when the multi-state circuit is in an active mode."

Thus, Son et al. do not teach or suggest claim 1 as amended.

Applicant respectfully submits that one or both of the above distinctions apply generally to the other pending claims as well. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that Son et al. do not teach or suggest any of claims 2-23 or 29-31 or 35-40, either.

Double Patenting

The examiner provisionally rejected claims 17-20 under 35 USC 101 as claiming the same invention as claims 17-20 of copending Application No. 10/155,490. The examiner noted that this rejection is provisional since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

Applicant cancelled the conflicting claims from the copending Application for reasons unrelated to the examiner's rejection herein. In essence, Applicant cancelled the conflicting claims

in view of USP 6,759,873, which names as inventors the same inventors as that are named as inventors in the present Application.

Thus, the double patenting rejection is moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

The examiner indicated that claims 2-7 and 13-16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has amended the claims, including claims 2-7 and 13-16, in view of USP 6,759,873.

New Claims

Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 35-40 do not include new matter. An example of support for these claims is provided in the specification at paragraph [0062].

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant has submitted herewith an Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement disclosing USP 6,759,873.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no.416272004201. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: November 15, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Stephen C. Durant
Registration No.: 31,506
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94105
(415) 268-6982